## REMARKS

Re-examination and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority, and for indicating that all of the certified copies of the priority document were received in parent application number 09/868,660. Applicants further thank the Examiner for indicating that the submitted drawings are accepted.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner noted that several elements in the claims lack a proper antecedent basis.

By the current amendment, Applicants cancel claims 1-13 and submit new claims 14-25 that have been drafted paying particular attention to the concerns raised by the Examiner. In view of the submission of new claims for the Examiner's consideration, Applicants submit that the grounds for the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection no longer exists, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-13 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,707,692 to HIGGINS et al. According to a feature of the present invention, a frequency reducer is

connected in parallel with a switching element. The switching reducer operates to reduce a resonance frequency of an LC resonance that results from a parasitic capacitance of the switching element and an inductance component of an interconnector. Applicants submit that at least this feature is lacking from HIGGINS et al.

Applicants submit that HIGGINS et al. discloses an external capacitor 312 that is arranged in parallel with a display load 310 for the purpose of setting a <a href="https://display.com/higher-resonance-frequency">higher resonance frequency</a>. See column 3 line 46 to column 4 line 57. Applicants submit that the configuration of external capacitor 312 and any of switches CHMOD, DISCHMOD, MODUP and MODDOWN in HIGGINS et al. differs (and, in fact, is opposite to) that of the frequency <a href="reducer-area">reducer</a> and switch of Applicants' claimed invention.

Further, Applicants submit that column drive circuit 230 of HIGGINS et al. is completely different from the driving circuit of Applicants' claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants submit that the path of charges from row electrodes 215 to display panel 100 in HIGGINS et al. is completely different from the path of charges from the recovering capacitor to the display panel in Applicants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the structure of HIGGINS et al. is completely different from the present invention, and fails to anticipate the current invention, as defined by the claims. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection.

As indicated above, Applicants cancel original claims 1-13 and submit new claims 14-25 for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants note that claims 14, 17 and 20 are directed to the disclosed embodiment that includes switch Q3 and diode D1. Claims 15, 18 and 21 are directed to the disclosed embodiment that includes switch Q4 and diode D2. Claims 16, 19 and 22 are directed to the disclosed embodiment that includes switches Q3 and Q4 and diodes D1 and D2. Applicants submit that the newly submitted claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to indicate the allowability of claims 14-25, and to pass this application to issue.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the present invention as now defined by the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Should the Commissioner determine that an extension of time is required in order to render this response timely and/or complete, a formal request for an extension of time, under 37 C.F.R. ∍1.136(a), is herewith made in an amount equal to the time period required to render this response timely and/or complete. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any

{P23981 SW0006.DOC}

required extension of time fee under 37 C.F.R. ∋1.17 to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

If there should be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted, Shigeo KIGO et al.

Bruce H. Bernstein

Reg. No. 29,027

Steven Wegman Reg. No. 31,438

July 31, 2006 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 Roland Clarke Place] Reston, VA 20191 (703) 716-119117